



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/956,971	09/21/2001	Thomas E. Slowe	37112-173581	6865

26694 7590 10/05/2004

VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP
P.O. BOX 34385
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998

EXAMINER

CZEKAJ, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/956,971

Applicant(s)

SLOWE ET AL.

Examiner

Dave Czekaj

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 September 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because: in figure 6, item 70, the examiner understood "paramters" to be "parameters". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page6, line 16, the examiner understood "Figure 4" to be "Figure 6".

On page 19, line 5, the examiner understood "block 37" to be "block 39" and "block 39" to be "block 40".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 14 objected to because of the following informalities: The examiner understood "deleing" to be "deleting". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-2, 22, 25-27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maeda (6625316).

Regarding claims 1, 25-27, and 29, Maeda discloses an apparatus that relates to extracting an object from an image and processing the extracted image (Maeda: column 1, lines 8-11). This apparatus comprises "editing at least one or more original camera motion layers to obtain modified camera motion layers such that each from of a video sequence composed from the modified camera motion layers and the original fixed frame layers is obtained without editing each from of the original sequence" (Maeda: column 13, lines 15-28, wherein the

original camera motion layers is the background, the editing is the process of modifying the input, and the modified layer is the background after the editing has occurred).

Regarding claims 2 and 22, Maeda discloses "converting one of the original camera motion layers to an original image" (Maeda: column 13, lines 15-28, wherein the converting is the decoding to obtain an image), "editing to obtain a modified image" (Maeda: column 13, lines 15-28, wherein the editing is the process of modifying the input), and "converting the modified image to one of the modified camera motion layers" (Maeda: column 14, lines 38-40, wherein the modified image is converted or synthesized with the rest of the layers).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda (6625316) in view of Jasinski et al. (6504569), (hereinafter referred to as "Jasinski").

Regarding claims 3 and 23, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, claims 3 and 23 differ from claim 1 in that claims 3 and 23 further require rectifying the original and modified image prior to editing and converting the image. Jasinski teaches that it is well known in the art to rectify an image

before manipulating the object (Jasinski: column 1, lines 20-31, wherein the rectifying is projecting the images on different planes). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Maeda and add the image rectifying taught by Jasinski in order to obtain an apparatus that edits an object correctly by first placing the object in the correct perspective.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Maeda discloses "inserting, deleting, or changing a portion to obtain modified camera motion layers" (Maeda: column 13, lines 15-28, wherein the changing is the enlargement or reduction which then replaces the camera motion layer).

8. Claims 6, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda (6625316) in view of Foreman et al. (6628303), (hereinafter referred to as "Foreman").

Regarding claims 6 and 15, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, claims 6 and 15 differ from claim 1 in that claims 6 and 15 further require adding a video sequence to the original camera motion layers. Foreman teaches that prior art video processing systems are very complex utilizing multiple windows for controlling parameters of video (Foreman: column 1, lines 39-41). To help alleviate this problem, Foreman discloses a single interface wherein a user can "add a video sequence to one of the original camera motion layers" (Foreman: figure 8, column 9, lines 61-62, wherein the video sequence is the shots). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Maeda and add the editing system taught by Foreman in order to obtain an apparatus that is easy to use by all users.

Regarding claim 13, Foreman discloses "modifying an order of one of the original camera motion layers" (Foreman: figure 8, column 9, lines 61-67, wherein modifying the order is modifying the order in which the video is inserted).

9. Claims 7-12, 14, 16-21, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda (6625316) in view of Petelycky et al. (6204840), (hereinafter referred to as "Petelycky").

Regarding claim 7, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, claim 7 differs from claim 1 in that claim 7 further requires adding an animation sequence to one of the original camera motion layers. Petelycky teaches that prior art video editing systems are difficult to learn and use (Petelycky: column 1, lines 39-44). To help alleviate this problem, Petelycky discloses an apparatus that provides an interface that allows the user to "add animation sequences to one of the original camera motion layers" (Petelycky: figure 3E, column 15, lines 1-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Maeda and add the editing system taught by Petelycky in order to obtain an apparatus that is easy to learn and use.

Regarding claims 8-9, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to add a 3-D object or user-activated region to one of the camera motion layers

(Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order to make the video more appealing to the user.

Regarding claim 10, Petelycky discloses "modifying an on/off time of one of the original camera motion layers" (Petelycky: figure 3B, wherein the on/off time is modified by use of the sliders).

Regarding claim 11, Petelycky discloses "modifying an opaqueness of one of the original camera motion layers" (Petelycky: figure 3E, wherein the opaqueness is modified using the transparent slider).

Regarding claim 12, Petelycky discloses "modifying fade-in/fade-out of one of the original camera motion layers" (Petelycky: figure 3F, items 364-365).

Regarding claim 14, Petelycky discloses "deleting one of the original camera motion layers" (Petelycky: column 11, lines 53-54).

Regarding claim 16, Petelycky discloses "modifying a size of one of the original camera motion layers" (Petelycky: figure 3E, wherein the size is modified by the size slider).

Regarding claims 17-19 and 24, Maeda discloses "editing camera motion parameters of one of the original camera motion layers" (Maeda: column 13, lines 15-25, wherein the camera motion parameters are described by the affine transformation, which is based on analytical calculations for both the foreground and background objects).

Regarding claim 20, Maeda discloses "replacing the camera motion parameters with camera motion parameters from another video sequence"

(Maeda: column 13, lines 15-25, column 14, lines 38-44, wherein replacing is the synthesizing different objects from different source layers which all have different camera motion parameters or affine transformations).

Regarding claims 21 and 28, Maeda discloses "editing at least one of the fixed-frame layers" (Maeda: figure 15, wherein the cattle is the fixed frame layer or foreground object).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US-6356664	03-2002	Dunn et al.
US-5404316	04-1995	Klingler et al.
US-5764306	06-1998	Steffano, Michael D.
US-20010041049	11-2001	Kanda, Takeshi
US-6154600	11-200	Newman et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (703) 305-3418. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000